

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 15-20 and 26-30 are pending. Applicant has amended claim 1, 15, and 30.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 15-20, and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the Advisory Action of February 23, 2007, the Examiner states that "the specification seems only to support monitoring the management database and not monitoring the network devices themselves." Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 15 to clarify. Independent claims 1 and 15 now recite "monitoring conditions on the computer network to detect network conditions of network devices." The specification supports this clarification by describing that "the server computer 154 monitors various conditions on the network 152 for any change that would indicate a need for the client computer 150 to have new configuration settings." (Specification, 8:7-9.) Independent claim 30 already recited "monitoring conditions on the network to detect network conditions of network devices." The specification also describes that the "management database 182 can be changed ... automatically as a result of changes in the network 170." (Specification, 20:20-22.) So, the monitoring of network conditions may be effected by monitoring for changes in the management database.

The Examiner has rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the following combination of references:

Claims	References
1-2, 4-5, 8, 15-18, 30	Turner, Hubbard
6-7, 19-20, 28-29	Turner, Hubbard, Handley
3, 26-27	Turner, Hubbard, Rosenberg

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner suggested that claims be amended to clarify the term "configuration settings" to help overcome this rejection. As suggested, applicant has amended the claims to clarify this term. Independent claims 1 and 15 now recite "the configuration settings including an identification of a real-time communication server through which the client computer is to engage in real-time communication and an identification of a communication protocol for communicating with the real-time communication server." Independent claim 30 now recites "the changed configuration settings providing information on how to engage in real-time communication with a real-time communication server as a result of the detected change in conditions of the network." The Examiner believes that "Turner's display element identifiers, input identifiers, GUI elements, etc." correspond to applicant's "configuration settings." These identifiers and elements cannot be considered to be information on how to engage in real-time communications as a result of a detected change in conditions of a network or the identification of a real-time communications server and a communication protocol as now recited by the amended claims.

Based upon these amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: May 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio

Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant